

1977

Procedure for Consideration of the Instructional Development Program

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills

Recommended Citation

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate, "Procedure for Consideration of the Instructional Development Program" (1977). *Faculty Senate Bills*. Paper 586.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills/586

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Bills by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.


See letter 6/30/77 & 7/22/77

Serial Number #76-77--36

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Kingston, Rhode Island

FACULTY SENATE
BILL

Adopted by the Faculty Senate



TO: President Frank Newman

FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The attached BILL, titled Procedure for Consideration of the Instructional Development Program.

is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.
3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on May 5, 1977 (date)
4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Regents, completing the appropriate endorsement below.
5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on May 26, 1977 (date), three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Regents for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Regents, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

May 6, 1977
(date)

Daniel P. Bergen
Chairman of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: President of the University

1. Returned.
2. Approved ✓. Disapproved _____.
3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Regents is not necessary.

7/5/77
(date)

President

(OVER)

ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Regents

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

(date)

President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Chairman of the Board of Regents, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

(date)

(Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Regents.

(date)

President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

(date)

Chairman of the Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Kingston, Rhode Island

FACULTY SENATE

On May 5, 1977, the Faculty Senate adopted the following recommendations of the Curricular Affairs Committee regarding the consideration of the I.D.P.:

1. That the Senate request that the Joint Educational Policy Committee include the IDP in its 1977-78 new program review. If the JEPC recommends that the IDP be continued as a general revenue funded program, the JEPC shall recommend what priority should be given the IDP among the new programs recommended for approval.
2. That the Senate direct the Curricular Affairs Committee and the Teaching Effectiveness and Facilities Committee to prepare jointly recommendations which specify the responsibilities, organization, and supervision of the Instructional Development Program. These recommendations shall be forwarded to the Joint Educational Policy Committee no later than January 2, 1978.
3. That the Faculty Senate reserve its final decision on the establishment of a general revenue-funded Instructional Development Program until it receives the recommendations mentioned in 1 and 2 above.

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
Kingston, Rhode Island

FACULTY SENATE

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE

March 16, 1977

Review of Instructional Development Program, including consideration of continuation of the program after the third year (1977-78) of the Lilly Endowment grant (Senate Bill #75-76--4, September 25, 1975)

The Instructional Development Program (IDP) was formally initiated at URI on September 2, 1975 after the University received a three-year grant from the Lilly Endowment to help institute such a program. Professors Lanny Soderberg (Education) and Don Kunz (English) developed the successful grant proposal and submitted it to Lilly on behalf of Vice President William Ferrante (Document #1)*. Twenty-three days after the IDP started operation, the Faculty Senate charged the Teaching Effectiveness and Facilities Committee (TEFC) with the task of overseeing and reviewing the general functioning of IDP. In addition, the Senate specifically requested that the TEFC consider the question of IDP continuation at the conclusion of Lilly Endowment support in August 1978. (The IDP budget, detailing University and Lilly contributions over the three year period, is presented in Document #2.)

This year's TEF Committee feels that the question of IDP continuation should be addressed early and has, therefore, spent most of its time this academic year collecting information that will help the Senate arrive at an informed decision on this issue. The remainder of this report will summarize the salient features of the Instructional Development Program from September 1975 through February 1977, together with data relevant to an evaluation of specific activities. Our analysis is aided by two external reviews of IDP (prescribed by the original Lilly proposal) conducted by independent agencies outside the University as well as self-evaluations carried out by the IDP staff. The evaluation which follows is organized in terms of IDP's formal objectives.

A. Assistance and consultation to individuals who want to improve their effectiveness as teachers

During the first year of operation (9/75 to 8/76), the IDP conducted an individualized teaching consultation process with 31 instructors, spending an average of about 20 hours working with each person inside and outside the classroom. Twenty-three of the 31 instructors completed a questionnaire evaluating the effectiveness of the consultation service after reviewing data gathered on their teaching (Document #3, pp. 8-11). Seventeen of the 31 answered another questionnaire at the conclusion of the complete consultation service (Document #3, pp. 11-13), and 24 of the total group responded to an anonymous questionnaire from the 1975-76 TEFC (Document #3, Appendix C). Seventeen of the 31 faculty members who used the consultation service were interviewed by the 1975-76 external evaluation team (Bernard Cohen Research & Development, New City, N.Y.). These responses are presented in Document #3, Appendix A, pp. 23-31.

* Documents are available in the Faculty Senate Office.

The data gathered by the four different approaches listed above showed highly consistent and strongly positive reactions on the part of the program participants to the IDP's individualized consultation process. The results point to an overwhelming acceptance of, and enthusiasm for, this aspect of the IDP's services by its beneficiaries.

During the Fall 1976 Semester, the IDP conducted a field experiment by comparing 15 randomly assigned instructors who agreed to participate in the individualized program with a control group of 16 instructors, also randomly assigned, who took the pretests and posttests but did not go through the consultation process.

The results of this research (Document #4) show that students at the end of the semester perceive significantly more change, and more positive change, in instructors in the experimental group than students see in control group instructors in the areas of: student involvement and stimulation; course organization and clarity; and clarity of expectations and evaluation. No differences were found between experimental and control groups in students' ratings of progress toward general instructional goals. Instructors in the experimental group perceived significantly more positive change in themselves during the course of the semester than did instructors in the control group in areas of: student involvement and stimulation; course organization and clarity; and clarity of expectations and evaluation. On an additional questionnaire, instructors in the experimental group gave an overwhelming positive response to items designed to assess the value of the teaching consultation service.

It is important to note here that, because of experimental treatments, i.e., classroom videotaping and classroom observation, both students and faculty were aware of which of the two groups they were in. The effect of this knowledge cannot be completely assessed. However, the students did not know the specific teaching areas that were the focus of the consultation service for their particular professors. It may, therefore, be assumed that these areas should have improved more (in the view of the students) than other aspects of the course that were not targeted for consultation. This in fact happened. Instructors in the experimental group were seen to accomplish even greater gains in those areas where IDP improvement efforts had been concentrated (Document #4).

The second (1977) external evaluation of IDP (Document #5), conducted by Dr. Jon F. Wergin, Assistant Professor, Educational Planning and Development Program, Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, gathered information relevant to the individual consultation process. Dr. Wergin sent a follow-up questionnaire to 15 former participants (1975-1976) who were on campus at the time of his study. He received only 10 completed forms. All of these respondents indicated that specific improvements in their teaching, mediated by the IDP consultation, continued to be utilized one year later (Document #5, pp. 8; 28-30). This year's (Fall 1976) participants appear to feel the same way since 11 of 13 individuals responding to an IDP survey said they believed that the IDP improvement strategies did, in fact, improve their teaching.

One additional follow up survey was conducted by the IDP staff to determine whether student ratings of professors' teaching behaviors would reflect the changes that professors had experienced in themselves. To accomplish this, the IDP studied 35 teaching skill areas of 18 past participants who were teaching the same or comparable courses one to three semesters after the original consultation process. Students rated the classroom instructional activities of these professors early in the semester. These early semester ratings were then compared with the similar early semester ratings the professors received before the IDP consultation. Twelve individuals showed a significantly positive change in one or more skill area and no negative change in any area; for two of the individuals there was a significantly negative change in one skill; and in four cases there was no significant difference on any skill (Document #4).

B. Increase faculty awareness about issues in higher education and interest in teaching and learning

IDP activities in this area are designed to increase interest in teaching, including increased general commitment to instructional improvements. The January intersession Teaching/Learning Colloquia were particularly directed toward these goals.

The 1976 colloquia consisted of four 90 minute sessions on Monday through Thursday (1/12 to 1/15). These were entitled: The Importance of Teaching at URI: Rhetoric or Reality; Increased Student Involvement in Learning; Teaching and Learning in Large Classes; and, Grading Students. Average attendance per session was approximately 100, with about 150 different people from some 50 academic departments attending one or more of the sessions. A majority of participants responded to a questionnaire evaluating the sessions. The majority of responses to the evaluative items was very positive, indicating that most people in attendance found the colloquia stimulating, obtained specific ideas about improving their own teaching, and would probably discuss the substance of a particular colloquium with colleagues (Document #3, p. 5).

The 1976 external evaluators interviewed a random sample of 11 who attended the colloquia. Nine of these individuals felt the sessions were "very worthwhile" (4) or "worthwhile" (5) and that the sessions were useful and relevant to their needs; one felt they were moderately worthwhile; and one felt they were "not worthwhile at all."

In September 1976 the IDP conducted a Workshop Series on College Teaching for 17 Graduate Teaching Assistants and a Discussion Skills Workshop for 6 Honors Colloquium discussion leaders. The participant evaluations of these activities are overwhelmingly positive (Document #6).

The 1977 intersession colloquia (1/11 to 1/13) were organized around morning presentations and afternoon workshops. The morning lecture-discussions were: The Mythology of Teaching: Challenging some Common Assumptions (Kenneth I. Eble, English, University of Utah); Some Experiments in Teaching at URI (Leo Carroll, Joan Lausier, Jack Willis, Don Kirwan); Consulting Trios: Working with Colleagues to Improve Your Teaching (Anthony Grasha, University of Cincinnati). Participant evaluations indicate that the session on URI teaching experiments was most positively received (some 90% of the ratings were positive). About 2/3 of the

evaluators felt the other presentations were generally good, with the talk on mythology of teaching drawing the most variable responses, including the most negative ones (Document #7).

The afternoon workshops were: Planning for Instruction (Glenn Erickson); Running and Using Discussion Groups, I & II (Bette Erickson); Effective Design and Use of Assignments (Karen Stein, English; John Stevenson, Psychology). All of the ratings of these sessions were uniformly positive (Document #8).

As part of the 1977 external evaluation, Dr. Wergin interviewed ten Senators, chosen by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, to represent a range of opinion about IDP. The interviews covered many topics relative to IDP's image in the University, views of present consumers, potential clients, present and potential programs (Document #5, pp. 12-17). The major themes emerging from the Senator interviews are summarized in Document #5, pp. 31-32. While it is difficult to characterize succinctly the variety of responses derived from these interviews, it does appear that IDP is viewed favorably by the Senators and many of them made suggestions about expanded utilization of IDP.

C. Increase faculty awareness of, and positive perceptions toward, IDP

Initially, of course, IDP had to make itself known to the URI faculty before its services could be used. This has been accomplished through news releases, material for This Week, the IDP Bulletin, presentations to various faculty and administrative groups, including an Arts and Sciences Colloquium, the Faculty Senate, and information-sharing interviews with all department heads, deans, representatives of the Faculty Senate and AAUP, and distinguished teaching award winners.

IDP is considering strengthening its resources by asking highly skilled teachers and administrators to conduct symposia and aid in the teaching consultation process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Instructional Development Program be continued as a permanent program and that the University take over the funding at a comparable level of support after the expiration of the Lilly Endowment grant in August 1978.
2. That the Instructional Development Program should continue offering a balance of services, continuing to concentrate on the teaching consultation process as its primary service.
3. That the Teaching Effectiveness and Facilities Committee, in consultation with the Director of the Instructional Development Program, consider the desirability and feasibility of developing a teaching effectiveness program that would be routinely taken by incoming faculty. In addition, this committee should consider the desirability and feasibility of implementing the following recommendations contained in the external evaluation conducted by Dr. Jon Wergin in 1977 (Document #5):

*Not
Acted
upon
by
the Faculty
Senate*

- a) training graduate teaching assistants in educational methods;
- b) work with intact academic units in curriculum development and revision.

W. Brownell, Speech
C. Hames, Nursing
R. Hinkson, Animal Science
J. Kaiser, Chemistry, Graduate Student
A. Lott, Psychology, Chairperson
W. Nagel, Education
A. Swonger, Pharmacy